

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/904,875</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Asanuma et al.</b>
	Examiner <b>Tu M. Nguyen</b>	Art Unit <b>3748</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tu M. Nguyen (examiner)

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Paul Tsou (attorney)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 5, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic      b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes      e) No. If yes, brief description:

\_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:

Maaseidvaag et al. (U.S. Patent 6,167,696), Takeshima et al. (U.S. Patent 5,473,890), and Dou et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0035006)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The proposed amended claim 5 to include an upstream catalytic converter that has an adsorbing and reducing NOx function is able to overcome Maaseidvaag et al. and appears allowable pending new search and consideration.

Regarding claim 1, applicant's argument that the prior art of record fail to show an upstream catalytic converter that carries the same catalyst as the downstream filter for adsorbing and reducing NOx is persuasive. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable pending further search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**THOMAS DENION**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**

Tu M. Nguyen  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.